REMARKS

Applicants respectfully submit this amendment and remarks in response to the Official Action mailed May 5, 2006.

A petition for a three (3) month extension of time for responding to the Official Action is herewith submitted.

Claims 2-21 and 23-42 have been canceled.

Claims 1 and 22 have been amended.

Claims 1-42 are pending

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Rejection under 35 USC 103

The Examiner rejects claims 3-6, 8-11, 17-21, 24-27, 29-32 and 38-42 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Woog et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,503,827). Applicants have canceled claims 3-6, 8-11, 17-21, 24-27, 29-32 and 38-42. Therefore, the rejection to these claims has been obviated.

Rejection under 35 USC 102

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 7, 12, 14-16, 22, 23, 28, 33 and 35-37 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Woog et al (US Pat. No. 5,503,827). Applicants have canceled claims 2, 7, 12-13, 14-16, 23, 28, 33 and 34-37. The only remaining claims are claims 1 and 22, which Applicants have amended as shown above.

Claims 1 and 22 are not anticipated by Woog et al. because Woog et al. does not teach the combination of the amount of each component claimed in the composition, while the law of anticipation requires the prior art reference to teach each and every element of the invention in a single document and to enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to make the invention. Thus, Woog et al. fails to anticipate claims 1 and 22 as presently amended.

Nor would Woog et al. render claims 1 and 22 obvious for the same reason, since the law of obviousness also requires the presence of all elements of the invention in the prior art

references, alone or in combination. Absent teachings of the relative amounts of various components in the present invention, it would require undue experimentation for a person of ordinary skill in the art to reach the same conclusion as Applicants have done. Moreover, Woog et al. teaches away from the present invention by varying the relative amount of each component in the disclosed examples, but none of them discloses the combination of claims 1 and 22. Nor does Woog et al. as a whole suggest the combination in the amended claims 1 and 22. Thus, it would not be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, who confronted with the same problem, to resolve the issue in the same way as Applicants, absent the teaching of the present application.

Accordingly, the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) has been overcome and should be withdrawn. Allowance of claims 1 and 22 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By:___/Yunling Ren/_____
YUNLING REN
Reg. No. 47,019

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-3385
Dated: November 6, 2006